

**REMARKS****Status of the Claims**

- Claims 1, and 3-10 are pending in the Application after entry of this amendment.
- Claims 1 and 3-10 are rejected by Examiner.
- Claims 1, 3-10 are amended by Applicant.

**Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1 and 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Application No. WO 02/33902 to Straub et al. (Straub) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,160,796 to Zou, and in further view of US Patent No. 7,505,455 to Goodwin et al. (Goodwin). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 1 and 9 are amended to include the aspect that only a reset message from said series of reset messages signaling an alternation in the direction of change of the number of nodes on said first bus. Support for this amendment can among others found at page 8 lines 5-22 of the as-filed specification. Other claims are amended to adjust informalities.

As admitted by the present final Office Action dated 8 June 2010, Straub does not disclose only transmitting reset messages signaling an alternation in the direction of change of a number of nodes occurs on the first bus.

Zou discusses at col. 12 lines 1-17 that bus resets occur when a device is inserted or removed ("since any topology change within 1394 bus will cause a bus reset to occur"). So, according to Zou, a bus reset message is transmitted upon each removal or addition. However, Zou fails to disclose selection from a series of reset messages of a message that indicates an alternation in the direction of change of the number of nodes (1 to n) on a first bus as is recited by pending amended Claims 1 and 9. Rather, Zou discusses transmitting reset messages each time a topology change occurs, i.e. removal of a single device, adding of a single device, removal of one or several devices at the same time, adding of several devices at the same time, replacement of one device by another, or replacement of several devices at the same time. Thus, Zou

systematically transmits all reset messages resulting of a topology change, rather than making a selection between those messages to transmit and those not to transmit. The feature is also not disclosed by Goodwin, nor would the feature have been obvious for the skilled in the art at the time of the invention from a combination between the cited documents because the feature is absent from the disclosure of either Zou or Goodwin.

Since the combination of Straub, Zou, and Goodwin does not teach or suggest all of the elements of independent amended Claims 1 and 9, then the combination of Straub, Zou, and Goodwin cannot render obvious amended independent Claims 1 and 9 under 35 USC §103(a). Thus, these claims are patentably distinct from the cited combination. Additionally, dependent Claims 3-8, which ultimately depend from amended Claim 1, and dependent Claim 10, which depends from independent Claim 9, also are patentably distinct per MPEP per §2143.03.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of Claims 1, and 8-10. Applicant notes that no specific rejections are made concerning pending dependent Claims 3, 5, and 7.

Claims 4 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Application No. WO 02/33902 to Straub et al. (Straub), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,160,796 to Zou, in view of US Patent No. 7,505455 to Goodwin et al. (Goodwin), and in further view of US Pat 6,466,549 to Hattig. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 4 and 6 depend from amended independent Claim 1, and incorporate by reference all of the features of that claim. Hattig, like Straub, Zou, and Goodwin, fails to teach or suggest the aspect that only a reset message from said series of reset messages signaling an alternation in the direction of change of the number of nodes on said first bus.

Since the combination of Straub, Zou, Goodwin, and Hattig does not contain all of the elements of independent amended Claim 1 upon which Claims 4 and 6 depend, then the combination of Straub, Zou, Goodwin, and Hattig cannot render obvious amended independent Claims 4 and 6 under 35 USC §103(a) per MPEP per §2143.03.

## Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the amended pending claims patentably define over the cited art and respectfully requests continued examination, reconsideration, and withdrawal of all rejections of the pending claims based on the amendments and arguments above.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 07-0832 therefore.

Respectfully submitted,  
Burklin, et al.

Date: September 7, 2010

/Jerome G. Schaefer/

---

Jerome G. Schaefer  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 50, 800  
(609) 734-6451

THOMSON Licensing LLC  
Patent Operation  
PO Box 5312  
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312